DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 754 SP 011 967

AUTHOR Razor, Jack E.
TITLE The New Spirit in Administration.
PUB DATE Jan 78
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at Mid-America College and University Physical Education Conference (Chicago, Illinois, January 20, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Responsibility; *Administrator Role; Educational Quality; Faculty Promotion; Financial Problems; Legal Problems; *Needs Assessment; *Physical Education; *Program Planning; Scheduling; *Staff Utilization; Teacher Evaluation; Tenure; Unions

ABSTRACT

This paper examines seven specific areas of concern for the administrator of a college physical education department. These major concerns are identified and discussed: (1) financial accountability; (2) staffing patterns; (3) unions in higher education; (4) assessment of staff and program; (5) promotion and tenure; (6) legal aspects of off-campus activities; and (7) organization patterns for program scheduling. (JD)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jack E. Razor

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

ED148754

THE NEW SPIRIT IN ADMINISTRATION

Mid-America College and University Conference
Chicago, Illinois, January 1978

Paper Presented at the Mid-America College and University
Physical Education Conference: The General Program

Jack E. Razor
Illinois State University

My primary responsibility as requested by the conference leadership is to provide a thoughtful overview of the administrative aspects of the general program which range from financial accountability through promotion and tenure to organizational patterns for program scheduling. I will attempt to do so by providing introductory observations, commenting ever so briefly on each of the topics in the "administrative strand" and conclude with a brief summary. In-depth analysis, solutions to specific problems, and directional focus will be provided by those presenting papers in the various areas or perhaps achieved through ideas expressed at the "idea mart."

I believe that it is important from an administrative purview to have a philosophical perspective of the general physical education program for without it the program will flounder, be a repository for faculty with limited potential (if not faculty rejects), be a source of embarrassment rather than pride to your department or college and drain valuable and scarce resources needed to operate other departmental programs and endeavors. It is essential that the administrator know "why" the program is being offered, and to be able to effectively interpret this to a variety of publics in academe. The mechanical aspects of "how" the program functions, though important, should be considered only after the philosophical issue of "why" is encountered and understood.

SP011 967

Nearly everyone would agree that the individual components of the "general education" or "university studies" program of our colleges and universities are vital to the students' overall knowledge of the world. Colleges and universities differ in their approach to education: some place an emphasis on employment or professional skills, while others believe that there must be more to education than the acquisition of skills and knowledges which allow one to be gainfully employed. In the past few years, according to several national studies, higher education is changing its traditional curricular emphasis.

> As the idea of life-long learning becomes important, a shift in emphasis from employment skills to skills requisite to maintaining a healthy, rewarding personal life occurs. We also sense a re-definition of the content selected for these personal skills from humanities, biology, art, and general science to health, creativity, value clarification, problem solving and reasoning.
>
> Concrete evidence should be available that would demonstrate that the general physical education program not only identifies with the discipline from which it originates but is based on a philosophy consistent with the philosophy of general education within the total college or university. All those responsible for implementing the physical education program should, therefore, be cognizant of the philosophy as it relates to their institution.[1]

In this regard may I identify what I believe to be the primary purposes of the general physical education program in most colleges and universities to be:

> (1) to teach a variety of leisure-time activities at various skill levels so that students might participate in such activities during and after their university experience; (2) to provide instruction about, and an opportunity to participate in, selected programs of physical fitness which are designed to meet the individual fitness needs of the student; and (3) to convey knowledge and promote understanding which will facilitate an awareness and interest in sport, dance, and physical activity.[2]

While brevity in the identification of the objectives of the basic instruction program leads to a lack of definitive function, it does not

delimit the purview of the program. If anything it enhances such. Essentially students involved in the basic instruction program are concerned with learning skills and receiving information which may increase their productivity and facilitate their movement in an ever-changing environment. The degree to which programs are successful is a matter of concern and interest and a primary force in our meeting the next three days.

Having reflected on the importance of understanding "why" the program exists and the educational purposes it serves, may I comment upon some specific administrative concerns.

(1) Financial Accountability

Initially, and as I have said previously, I believe that higher education is in some trouble because of accountability models which have been imposed upon its operation and governance. It seems the ethical neutrality of science is being compromised by the practical considerations of economics. The people, via legislatures, boards of higher education and governing systems, have said that colleges and universities must account in some fashion, generally head counts and credit hour production, for the expenditure of funds, while failing to recognize that educating people to adapt to, change, and control their environment is a process different from running automobiles off an assembly line. Quality control measures thought to be beneficial when evaluating the Metropolitan Insurance Corporation are not appropriate when evaluating the Metropolitan Opera. Non-profit organizations should not have to accommodate profit-making success criteria.[3]

With regard to the general physical education program, many departments are in the process of identifying program priorities in view of having to function in a rather depressed economic environment as evidenced in diminished faculty support and capital expenditures. Of importance to us as

administrators is whether to expand the program offerings so as to maximize head counts and credit hours by devoting existing and future resources to its promotion and conduct; or whether to restrict its quantitative growth by directing resources toward qualitative program development, or simply to other programs.[4]

> While program expansion may appear on the surface to be self-serving in that it generates instructional units, the value of retaining faculty who contribute not only to the general program but to other viable program areas, should not be viewed with skepticism. Severing or unduly restricting one segment of an operation may severely limit the thrust of separate but related program areas. The domino effect in physical education is no less in evidence than it is in economics or politics. The general program serves not only as a source for research, teaching, and learning for students and faculty directly related to its conduct; but also serves as a base of support for graduate students and faculty who have ancillary interests and pursuits.[5]

Evaluating the cost effectiveness of the general program is a complex task. From a financial viewpoint we can examine it from a resource expended perspective wherein we take the salaries of the faculty assigned to teach a particular class and make comparisons. Some of the data will make us look cost effective; some will not. Utilizing a graduate assistant at $3,000 a year, $1,500 per semester, or approximately $400 per class of thirty students in a tennis class does not appear extensive, but when that ten o'clock class is followed by the same class at eleven o'clock with a full professor making $22,000 a year, $11,000 per semester, or approximately $1,300 per class of thirty students——and there is no discernible difference in instruction as viewed by the student or in actual skills learned, we do not look very cost efficient. From an educational perspective much research needs to be done to determine if we are successful. Can we attribute participation in later life to our teaching and programs? Is there any <u>real</u> difference in the extent of participation between those who attend college and those who do not?

One closing observation on the financial aspect, it may well be that because of unions, tenure policies, decreasing resources and a growing cadre of senior faculty on the one hand and the availability of quality, contemporary instruction (our graduates) in the private sector, complemented with excellent facilities and equipment on the other hand, that we will see more subcontracting of our courses out of the university. This is already in evidence in bowling, skin and scuba, skiing, wilderness courses, etc. These enterprises and activities are being directed by our physical education graduates who chose this arena rather than an institution, to use their expertise. From purely a "cost" effectiveness criterion this may be the direction of the future.

(2) Staffing Patterns

The quality of the general physical education program is closely related to the quality of faculty assigned to the program.

> The faculty should be sensitive to the physical and emotional capabilities and needs of students who select or are required to participate in the general program. These students will represent a wide range of skill level and the faculty should be technically knowledgeable and interested in teaching and working with those students who may have minimal levels of skill and interest, as well as with the motivated highly skilled person. They should be interested in teaching activity type courses where primary emphasis is given to "instruction" and "student-teacher" dialogue. Assignment of faculty not interested in teaching skills or knowledges to the undergraduate non-major to the general program simply as a means of filling a teaching load does a great disservice to the student, the image and productivity of the general program, and the long-range acceptance of physical education by society.[6]

In fact, a strong case can be made for assigning your better faculty to this program because it will be the last and perhaps most meaningful perception of formalized physical education that many influential tax-paying citizens will have.

> Those individuals assigned to teach in the program should have expertise in selected activities beyond that of a novice performer. Many students entering the university have beginning level skills and when advance skill is identified, the student should expect and receive quality instruction from a knowledgeable instructor. In order to accommodate quality instruction in a wide variety of activities for a broad spectrum of skill levels and accommodate the exigencies of higher education, the program will undoubtedly have as diverse population as its faculty. The diversity of the faculty need not adversely affect the quality of instruction; in fact, it may contribute significantly to its value.[7]

The program, however, should not be staffed overwhelmingly by graduate teaching assistants who are there to support the graduate program and whose primary interest in the program is to make a buck and/or use the students as subjects in their research. Neither should the program be staffed with a majority of faculty whose skill and expertise were gained twenty, twenty-five, thirty years ago with little or no concern for remaining contemporary or learning new and different activities. Further discussions, inquiry, and debate may take place later with regard to the advisability of employing non-professionals with technically sound expertise to teach in the program, but demanding that only professionally educated personnel be permitted to teach in the secondary programs, where little difference exists in the students' ages or learning patterns. Additionally, assignment of currently employed coaches, ex-coaches, research-oriented faculty, professors who themselves are being concerned only with professional preparation programs, and tenured faculty whose area of specialization is being phased down are matters of concern to all administrators. My personal feeling on this is that we are going to see more heterogeneity in the faculty teaching in the general physical education program with everything from Ph.D.s through nationally-renowned sports personalities, to local activity and equipment technicians. You will not, as with other programs, be able to describe, succinctly, those teaching in the basic instruction program.

(3) Unions in Higher Education

My personal knowledge of unions is limited and especially as to the effect on the operation of a general physical education program. I am sure Dr. Theunissen will relate with some specificity as to the impact which collective bargaining has had on basic instruction programs. I did, however, review a growing body of literature in this area, and for an overview found that

> . . . Collective bargaining in higher education can no longer be characterized as a truly new phenomenon. Presently, one out of every four faculty and professional staff, approximately 120,000 individuals—two-thirds of whom work in four-year colleges—are members of a labor organization (Garbarino 1977). The Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service estimates that professors at nearly 500 campuses are engaged in collective negotiations (ACBIS, Special Report #12). During 1976 alone, 15,000 faculty and professional staff elected bargaining agents—the highest number since 1971 (Garbarino and Lawler 1977). Moreover, in a number of eastern states, notably New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, 95 percent of the public institutions are organized. Kelley and Rodriguez (1977) predict that, on the basis of past and present trends, within the next decade 85 percent to 90 percent of American public postsecondary institutions and 50 percent to 55 percent of private colleges and universities will replace shared-authority systems with collective bargaining. One point is assured: unlike student activism in the sixties, faculty activism in the seventies is institutionalizing itself and, in the process, causing both subtle and overt changes in American institutions of higher education.[8]

> Research on the impact of unionism on faculty-administration interaction reveals little hard data and much speculation. Kemerer and Baldridge (1975) report that despite feelings of vulnerability, there is actually a shift toward greater administrative power. Internally, more and more decisions are forced upward, away from departments to the central administration. Mortimer and Richardson (1977) agree there is an increased centralization of decisionmaking authority, with the principal beneficiaries being state boards and executive branches of state governments.

> There is general agreement that the big losers will be middle-management personnel (deans and department chairmen) and, in multi-campus situations, local college presidents (Garbarino 1977a; Kelley and Rodriguez 1977; Ehrle and Earley 1977). It has also been suggested that "disenfranchised" groups, nonteaching professionals,

junior faculty and part-time personnel may attain greater leverage at the expense of senior faculty (Mortimer, ed., 1976).

> The most significant impact collective bargaining has had concerns the nature of the decisionmaking process. Unions have replaced procedures for consultation, which previously had been informal, tacit, and customary, with procedures that are formal, explicit, and contractual. The advent of collective bargaining has brought more people into the decisionmaking process and also has caused a proliferation of rules and regulations (Garbarino 1975; Leslie 1975). Administrators have become accountable for decisions which, before bargaining, could be sent back to academic committees for further deliberation. Collective bargaining will encourage the development and implementation of management systems in colleges and universities.[9]

(4) Assessment of Staff and Program.

Those of us in administrative roles know only too well the demand for assessment of both staff and programs. Much time and energy (and indirect costs) are being devoted to evaluating faculty for employment, promotion, tenure and dismissal and existing programs are on at least a quadrennial review cycle, with one program coming up every year for evaluation. Defending what you have, generating support and rationale for something new on forms supplied by internal review committees and external governing boards, leave little time for creative leadership. As we explore this assessment variable, I feel it is important for us as administrators to be concerned with two factors, efficiency and effectiveness, and not to confuse the two. Peter Drucker, the management consultant, has distinguished between efficiency and effectiveness by writing that efficiency is doing things right (the management model), while effectiveness is doing the right things.[10] With this in mind I would like to focus, briefly, upon the "right things" and at the program level, as staff assessment will be considered in promotion and tenure. As alluded to earlier we must understand "why" we are conducting the general physical education program. Consensus would suggest

it is to convey knowledges and understandings, increase awareness by introduction, teach skills for purposes of participation and enjoyment and to simply increase participation in some form of movement for self-fulfillment. Do the courses in your programs comply with these purposes? Are there gaps, huge gaps, which are not being filled? For example,

> . . . Course offerings should reflect the needs of students as identified on course request reports developed as a part of the university's pre-enrollment data or as data supplied by the students on report forms distributed by the department. The program should develop a system whereby student input will exert a significant influence on the type, level, time and duration of course offerings. A viable and sensitive program is one which is receptive to input from a variety of sources including student responses to questions concerning program operation and teaching effectiveness.[11]
>
> Programs should also attempt to identify the physical education experiences of the students prior to their university experience. While diagnostic testing is the most appropriate way of identifying these needs such a procedure is often time consuming and the validity of such tests tends to be wanting at least to the extent that mass testing is able to identify parameters of skill, fitness, and knowledge.
>
> The providing of courses at essentially the same level of instruction in the university as was provided at the secondary level is a needless and wasteful replication of effort. In fact, much criticism is aimed toward physical educators by both the recipient (the student) and individuals from other academic disciplines for such practices. The mirroring of curriculum at the university level is often an unconscious effort because those who design the curriculum at the university level often have very little input as to the background of their students. However, just as the secondary schools should plan their curriculum in light of what junior high schools offer, the university must perceive their students' needs in light of previous experiences.[12]

In any event, I feel we must first determine if we are doing the "right" things before we look at "how" we are doing them. We will need to conduct long-term studies which examine the practices, knowledges, and attitudes of those who participate in our programs and those who do not, the latter group including both college graduates and non-college attendees.

And lest that be viewed as something for someone else to do, department and program administrators can play a significant role in the conduct and completion of such studies. In leaving this topic I want to observe that what is really important in assessment is the change that occurs upon its completion, and that falls squarely upon the shoulders of the administrator, if only by definition. Assessment must be followed by action.

(5) Promotion and Tenure.

On balance, the criteria for promotion and tenure for those in the general programs should be no more or less demanding than those whose responsibilities are primarily in the professional preparation, graduate or research programs. And while that statement may seem fair and equitable with regard to access, the realities are to the contrary. Consider their plight: they are primarily, and justifiably so, skills-oriented where teaching others "how to" is their forte; they tend to have heavy teaching loads where pre- and post-class time is frequently demanding, especially for the good, dedicated teacher; typically they do not have research expertise, an area where kudos count heavily for promotion and tenure: it tends to be difficult to publish as there are few professional avenues and editorial boards seek balance in periodicals; they know little about the grant business and their area is too "applied" in any event; their colleagues frequently offer minimal support as they view the program tangential to the "real" academic work of the department; and review committees at the university level frequently give little credence to their teaching as evidenced that some universities do not give academic credit for the courses they teach and the academic image of the program is suspect especially by those who generally comprise such promotion and tenure committees.

Administrators are reluctant on occasion to tenure in a faculty member whose primary contribution is in the activity program because of rapidly changing student interests, not wanting to be potentially burdened with someone of limited teaching competency. Additionally, in order to maintain standards for faculty in other areas, administrators may appear to be hypocritical in denying tenure and associate or full professorships to faculty with limited scholarly productivity and marginal teaching ratings while granting tenure to a faculty member who also has little to show in the way of scholarly productivity but excellent teaching credentials, great flexibility in teaching assignment and someone who can be counted upon to make things happen in the department, serve on committees, etc.

If a problem exists, and it may or may not, varying from institution to institution, it may be confronted forthrightly using the same criteria for all as I stated earlier, or it may be that different criteria (or job descriptions), should be employed for each faculty member and value judgments made thereon.

> In this situation, faculty should be systematically and appropriately supervised and evaluated. Special consideration should be given to the rather unique teaching function performed by these faculty members and appropriate techniques for both their supervision and evaluation should be devised and compared with other units (i.e., art, music) who perform similar instructional services. Additionally, the onus is on the department to develop and interpret to the university administration the rationale for, and system employed in, supervision and evaluating program personnel. Frequently faculty in the general program are evaluated for merit salary, tenure, academic promotion and awards on criteria which are inappropriate and self-defeating. In order to attract and retain quality faculty, it is absolutely necessary that the system adopted for supervision and evaluation reflect the nature of the tasks performed and be accepted by those in a position of providing appropriate rewards.
>
> Faculty should learn new skills, conduct and attend seminars, conferences and demonstrations, and be prepared to update their teaching repertoire. Returning to a university or professional school

(i.e., golf or tennis clinics) during the summer or as a part of a sabbatical leave in order to broaden teaching potential is necessary in order to conduct a quality program. Re-tooling on the part of experienced faculty should be expected, if not obligatory.[13]

It may also be that we will eventually use only graduate assistants, faculty with tenure from other program areas, and temporary and part-time personnel. And lest an example be cited that such would be appropriate because you have some people on tenure with limited teaching flexibility and twenty years to serve, that same situation might prevail if other programs and faculty were closely examined. I am sure Drs. Clark and Alley will have more to say on this topic later and perhaps provide solutions to problems and cite current practices that are functional and capable of application in your respective situations.

(6) Legal Aspects of Off-Campus Activities.

My older son recently asked me what profession would there likely be a continuing demand for in the next twenty years; without hesitation I responded, "Law." We have medical attorneys, legal engineers, tax lawyers, sports arbitrators, and presidents of universities with law degrees. A large Philadelphia suburban school district recently employed a lawyer, with appropriate certificates, to become superintendent of schools. One university with which I am familiar has more attorneys in the Legal Counsels' Office and on retainer than they have tenured faculty in the Philosophy Department. Administrators in physical education are probably more aware of the increased attention being given to the legal aspects of program operation in higher education than those in most other disciplines. We have the potential of being sued because of product liability, attractive nuisance, no supervision, inadequate supervision, incompetent supervision (and instruction), negligence, etc. Additionally, we have faculty suing us for tenure, promotion, back pay because

of prior inequities, malfeasance, misfeasance, and failure to consider their right to teach certain courses. We have students suing us for failing to keep their records "open" and available to the public and parents suing us because they are available and "open" to the public. And, as we continue to take our courses off-campus, utilize the equipment and facilities of private profit-oriented enterprises, employ non-professional, or at least temporary personnel to teach the classes, and transport or require students to be at a distant site, we are more than likely going to need the services of legal counsel. I believe a physical educator with a law degree, or vice versa, a physical education lawyer if you will, could be kept extremely busy in private practice, as a consultant, or under the employ of a consortium of public schools and/or institutions of higher education. I do not think, however, that we can be intimidated, let the program suffer because of "threats" of suits. We must continue to be aggressive in our exploration of off-campus sites; continue to conduct courses that could not otherwise be offered; judiciously employ competent, temporary instructors, consult our legal counsel and become familiar with legal parlance; and share information about how programs are operated. It is becoming a more legally-defined and operated world, we must become competent and involved, for if we do not, we will become so conservative, so afraid, so limited in what we do that for all practical purposes we might just as well close down altogether. It will be the administrator's responsibility to take a leadership role in this area, not the faculty. You will have to get out of the office, off the campus, attend meetings, arrange for meetings, read, talk and write. We cannot pass this to the faculty as we might a curriculum matter or the evaluation of instructors. We cannot pass it <u>up</u> to other university administrators, they will shy away; it is our responsibility to initiate

and implement programs where legal considerations are involved.

(7) Organizational Patterns for Program Scheduling.

The scheduling of courses, classes, faculty, facilities, equipment, and students is complex but in many ways provides the administrator an avenue for program innovation and creativity that is absent in most other parts of his/her job. Efforts to increase or decrease enrollment, maintain and improve teaching standards, increase skill acquisition, and make more effective and efficient use of facilities, space and equipment are frequently, though perhaps incorrectly, attributed to the managerial skill and insight of the program administrator and department head. There are as many success stories as there are institutions. Literature reviews and informal discussions at professional conventions, conferences, and meetings yield a variety of ways of dealing with beginning and advanced instruction; identifying "popular" courses; registering students; acquiring faculty; assigning faculty; revising courses; awarding credit; assigning grades; evaluating performance; scheduling classes during the semester, during the week, during the day, and during the vacation periods; and acquiring and using off-campus facilities.

In fact, I would say there is more truly creative activity and innovative managerial administration going on in the basic instruction programs in physical education than all of the other programs combined. Certainly the potential is there. While Dr. Cassady will handle this area very well, may I make this observation to department chairpersons. We need bright, aggressive people to be program directors. These people need to be creative and competent administrators, not selected because they are competent teachers. They must be capable of interacting with all segments of the university. In fact, these people may need to be more persuasive, knowledgeable, politically

astute than those who are responsible for your teacher education and graduate programs. They will have to interface with all disciplines and a variety of students; work effectively with professional and technical staff; and be cognizant of the intricacies of curricular development and course approval. Program credibility, growth, and impact are probably more dependent upon the type of leadership found in this position than those of any of the other programs. If you are in a position to appoint and/or select, do so wisely; if you are an incumbent, you are in a responsible, but "fun" position. It can truly be a rewarding endeavor.

Summary.

In brief summary, we in administration, because of our leadership roles and managerial responsibilities, must recognize the importance which the general physical education program plays in higher education. The skills, knowledges, and fitness benefits derived by students from other disciplines should not be minimized. Societal demand and need for program offerings require our fullest attention. As mandated programs in physical education are eliminated in the public school sector, providing a contemporary general program at the college level becomes an ever greater responsibility. We must examine the use of our resources. The demand for teachers is decreasing and concomitantly there will be a decrease in the demand for graduate education. In view of this it may be that some of our current resources and energies can be devoted and re-directed to the general program. The present situation with all of its resulting ramifications may bring with it a renewal of interest and commitment to the general physical education program.

REFERENCES

1. Razor, Jack E., et al., "Standards for the General College Physical Education Program," Journal of Physical Education and Recreation, Volume 46, No. 7, September 1975, p. 25.

2. Razor, Jack E. and Donald E. Arnold, "Key Concepts in Developing a Basic Instruction Curriculum," Proceedings NCPEAM, 1970 Convention, Portland, Oregon, 1970, p. 255.

3. Razor, Jack E., "Future Career Opportunities and Patterns in Health, Physical Education and Recreation," Proceedings IAPPHPER, 29th Annual Conference, February 1976, p. 23.

4. Razor, Jack E., Florence D. Grebner, "Elective P. E. Programs: Expansion vs. Limitation," Journal of Physical Education and Recreation, Volume 46, No. 6, June 1975, p. 24.

5. Ibid.

6. Razor, Jack E., op. cit., "Standards . . . ," p. 28.

7. Ibid.

8. Julius, Daniel J., "Collective Bargaining in Higher Education: The First Decade," Research Currents, American Association for Higher Education, November 1977, p. 3.

9. Ibid., p. 5.

10. Hanken, Joseph N., "Assessing Higher Education's Standards: of Standards, Quality, Excellence, and Honesty," American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., October 13, 1977.

11. Razor, Jack E., op. cit., "Standards . . . ," p. 27.

12. Razor and Arnold, op. cit., "Key Concepts . . . ," p. 255.

13. Razor, Jack E., op. cit., "Standards . . . ," p. 27.